



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/536,987	11/04/2005	Neil Andre Roberts	VK0004USPCT	1005
23906	7590	01/31/2007	EXAMINER	
E I DU PONT DE NEMOURS AND COMPANY LEGAL PATENT RECORDS CENTER BARLEY MILL PLAZA 25/1128 4417 LANCASTER PIKE WILMINGTON, DE 19805			HARDEE, JOHN R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1751	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		01/31/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/536,987	ROBERTS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	John R. Hardee	1751	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-21,24 and 25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 10 and 14 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-9,11-13,15-21,24 and 25 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 31 May 2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>05312005</u> .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-21, 24 and 25, drawn to compositions comprising pentafluoroethane.

Group II, claim(s) 1-21, 24 and 25, drawn to compositions comprising trifluoromethoxydifluoromethane.

Group III, claim(s) 1-21, 24 and 25, drawn to compositions comprising hexafluorocyclopropane.

Group IV, claim(s) 1-21, 24 and 25, drawn to compositions comprising a mixture of two or more of the above. Should this group be chosen, further restriction will be required.

Having elected one of Groups I-IV, further restriction is required:

Each of the refrigerants in part (b), plus combinations of the refrigerants, constitutes a separate group, for a total of five groups, A-E.

Having elected one of Groups A-E, further restriction is required:

Each hydrocarbon in part (c) represents a separate group. As the list of hydrocarbons is essentially infinite, no numbering was attempted.

2. The inventions listed as Groups IA-IVE do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: No feature unites the inventions, as all components are variable, and most or all are well known refrigerants. In addition, part (c) of claim 1 is essentially infinite.

3. During a telephone conversation with Ms. Mary Ann Capria on January 14, 2007

a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of (a) =

Art Unit: 1751

pentafluoroethane; (b) = 1,1,1,2,3,3,3-heptafluoropropane; and (c) = butane or isobutane, claims 1-9, 11-13, 15-21, 24 and 25. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 10 and 14 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention. The remaining claims were searched and examined only to the extent that they read on the elected invention.

4. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Double Patenting

5. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

6. Claims 1-9, 11-13, 15-21, 24 and 25 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-24 of U.S. Patent No. 6,655,160. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the patented claims recite compositions comprising refrigerants from each of the Markush groups presently recited in amounts which overlap those presently recited. This reference differs from the presently claimed subject matter in that it does not recite a composition which reads on the present claims with sufficient specificity to constitute anticipation.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to make such a composition, because this reference recites compositions comprising all of the ingredients presently recited by applicants for inclusion in a refrigerant composition. The person of ordinary skill in the refrigeration art would expect the recited compositions to have properties similar to those compositions which are exemplified, absent a showing to the contrary.

In the case where the claimed ranges overlap or lie inside ranges disclosed by the prior art, a *prima facie* case of obviousness exists. *In re Wertheim*, 541 F.2d 257, 191 USPQ 90 (CCPA 1976); *In re Woodruff*, 919 F.2d 1575, 16 USPQ2d 1934 (Fed Cir. 1990).

7. Claims 1-9, 11-13, 15-21, 24 and 25 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 24-

41 of copending Application No. 10/632,817 and claims 1, 14, 15, 20-22, 24 and 26-33 of copending Application No. 10/936,717. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the patented claims recite compositions comprising refrigerants from each of the Markush groups presently recited in amounts which overlap those presently recited. This reference differs from the presently claimed subject matter in that it does not recite a composition which reads on the present claims with sufficient specificity to constitute anticipation.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to make such a composition, because this reference recites compositions comprising all of the ingredients presently recited by applicants for inclusion in a refrigerant composition. The person of ordinary skill in the refrigeration art would expect the recited compositions to have properties similar to those compositions which are exemplified, absent a showing to the contrary.

In the case where the claimed ranges overlap or lie inside ranges disclosed by the prior art, a *prima facie* case of obviousness exists. *In re Wertheim*, 541 F.2d 257, 191 USPQ 90 (CCPA 1976); *In re Woodruff*, 919 F.2d 1575, 16 USPQ2d 1934 (Fed Cir. 1990)..

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

8. *All of the double patenting rejections can be overcome by amending the claims to recite only the elected invention. No claims can pass to issue until all non-elected subject matter has been deleted from the claims.*

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

9. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

10. Claims 1-9, 11-13, 15-21, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In part (b), "1,1,1,2,3,3-heptafluoropropane" should be either "1,1,1,2,2,3,3-heptafluoropropane" or "1,1,1,2,3,3-heptafluoropropane". Both are known refrigerants, R227ca and R227ea, respectively. The examiner cannot find any indication in the specification or the priority documents regarding which isomer was intended. There is a two-prong test for correcting obvious chemical errors: It must be obvious that an error exists, and the correction should be obvious. Applicant's claims fail the latter test.

11. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

12. Claims 1-9, 11-13, 15-21, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In part (b), "1,1,1,2,3,3-

Art Unit: 1751

heptafluoropropane" should be either "1,1,1,2,3,3-heptafluoropropane" or "1,1,1,2,2,3,3-heptafluoropropane", and there is no way to determine which was intended. (See 112 1st. paragraph rejection above.)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

15. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-9, 11-13, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over GB 2,327,427A. The reference discloses refrigerant compositions comprising 5-60% of one or more (a) components, which may be pentafluoroethane; 30-94% of one or more (b) components, which may be 1,1,1,2,3,3,3-heptafluoropropane or 1,1,1,2,2,3,3-heptafluoropropane; and an unsubstituted hydrocarbon of at least 4 carbons at 1-10% (abstract). Suitable hydrocarbons include butane (p. 4, line 5). The suitability of other hydrocarbons meets the limitations of claim 6. While the limitations of claims 8 and 9 are not met, a *prima facie* case of obviousness exists where the claimed ranges and prior art ranges do not overlap but are close enough that one skilled in the art would have expected them to have the same properties. *Titanium Metals Corp. of America v. Banner*, 778 F.2d 775, 227 USPQ 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985). The limitations of claims 12 and 13 can be met while working within the general disclosure of the reference. Additional hydrofluorocarbons meeting the limitations of claims 16 and 18 are disclosed as suitable in the abstract, and the limitations of claims 20 and 21 can be met while working within the general disclosure of the reference. Claims 24 and 25 read on the disclosed use of the compositions. This reference differs from the claimed subject matter in that it does not disclose a composition which reads on applicant's claims with sufficient specificity to constitute anticipation.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to make such a composition, because this reference teaches that all of the ingredients recited by applicants are suitable for inclusion in a refrigerant composition. The person of ordinary

skill in the refrigeration art would expect the recited compositions to have properties similar to those compositions which are exemplified, absent a showing to the contrary.

In the case where the claimed ranges overlap or lie inside ranges disclosed by the prior art, a *prima facie* case of obviousness exists. *In re Wertheim*, 541 F.2d 257, 191 USPQ 90 (CCPA 1976); *In re Woodruff*, 919 F.2d 1575, 16 USPQ2d 1934 (Fed Cir. 1990).

16. Claims 1-9, 11-13, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over GB 2,356,867A. The reference discloses refrigerant compositions comprising at least 35% of one or more (a) components, which may be pentafluoroethane; at least 30% of one or more (b) components, which may be 1,1,1,2,3,3-heptafluoropropane or 1,1,1,2,2,3,3-heptafluoropropane; and n-butane or isobutane of at least 4 carbons at 1% to less than 2.3% (abstract). Since both hydrocarbons are disclosed as suitable, use of both would be obvious, meeting the limitations of claim 6. While the limitations of claims 2 and 3 are not met, a *prima facie* case of obviousness exists where the claimed ranges and prior art ranges do not overlap but are close enough that one skilled in the art would have expected them to have the same properties. *Titanium Metals Corp. of America v. Banner*, 778 F.2d 775, 227 USPQ 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985). The limitations of claims 12 and 13 can be met while working within the general disclosure of the reference. Additional hydrofluorocarbons meeting the limitations of claims 16 and 18 are disclosed as suitable in the abstract, and the limitations of claims 20 and 21 can be met while working within the general disclosure of the reference. Claims 24 and 25 read on the disclosed use of the

Art Unit: 1751

compositions. This reference differs from the claimed subject matter in that it does not disclose a composition which reads on applicant's claims with sufficient specificity to constitute anticipation.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to make such a composition, because this reference teaches that all of the ingredients recited by applicants are suitable for inclusion in a refrigerant composition. The person of ordinary skill in the refrigeration art would expect the recited compositions to have properties similar to those compositions which are exemplified, absent a showing to the contrary.

In the case where the claimed ranges overlap or lie inside ranges disclosed by the prior art, a *prima facie* case of obviousness exists. *In re Wertheim*, 541 F.2d 257, 191 USPQ 90 (CCPA 1976); *In re Woodruff*, 919 F.2d 1575, 16 USPQ2d 1934 (Fed Cir. 1990).

17. Any prior art made of record and not relied upon is of interest and is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to the examiner, Dr. John R. Hardee, whose telephone number is (571) 272-1318. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 until 4:30. In the event that the examiner is not available, his supervisor, Mr. Douglas McGinty, may be reached at (571) 272-1029.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8100..

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



John R. Hardee
Primary Examiner
January 17, 2007